

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/424,431	03/16/2000	JOHN W WONG	287300022USA	7974
7590 08/06/2004			EXAMINER	
BRINKS, HOFER, GILSON & LIONE			MENDOZA, MICHAEL G	
P.O. BOX 1039			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 3731	
CHICAGO, IL	00010			

DATE MAILED: 08/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	$\overline{}$		
Office Action Summany	09/424,431	WONG, JOHN W			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	100		
	Michael G. Mendoza	3731			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addr	ess		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this comr D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	munication.		
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 Ap	<u>oril 2004</u> .				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ This	action is non-final.				
) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	i3 O.G. 213.	-		
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 15 is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray	vn from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>15</u> is/are rejected.		·			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	epted or b) \square objected to by the I	Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct					
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO	<i>⊦</i> -152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).			
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received				
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior			tage		
application from the International Bureau			· ·		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list		ed.			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			
2) Notice of References Cited (PTO-092) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-1	.52)		
S. Patent and Trademark Office	4:0	and of Donos No. (Mail Date	00040004		

Application/Control Number: 09/424,431

Art Unit: 3731

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 15 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dietz 5485833 in view of Rienmueller et al. 5067494 in further view of Anderson et al. 6436127.
- 4. Dietz teaches an apparatus for suspending ventilation in a patient and delivering radiation therapy to the patient during suspended ventilation, the apparatus comprising: an apparatus for identifying a specific air flow direction and lung volume of the patient (col. 6, lines 12-16); and an apparatus for administering radiation therapy during the suspension of patient ventilation (col. 2, lines 4-37). It should be noted that Dietz fails to teach an apparatus for suspending patient ventilation.

Rienmueller et al. teaches a device with a common apparatus for suspending patient ventilation (col. 2, lines 12-19 and col. 3, lines 29-51)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to use the apparatus of Rienmueller et al.

Application/Control Number: 09/424,431

Art Unit: 3731

to assure that substantially no dislocation of organs or of anatomical structure ensues during a measurement or a therapy procedure (col. 2, lines 15-19). It should be further noted that Dietz/Rienmueller fails to teach a first and second operable valve adapted to control inhalation and exhalation of the patient. However it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a first and a second valve, since it has been held that constructing a formerly integral structure in various elements involves only routine skill in the art. Furthermore, it is well know in the art or ventilators to use an inhalation and exhalation valve for controlling breathing. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to close any valve creating a flow to be closed to completely suspend ventilation. It should be further noted that Dietz/Rienmueller fails to teach an abort switch adapted to halt the apparatus and for administering radiation therapy and open a closed one of the first and second selectively operable valves.

Anderson et al. teaches an apparatus for delivering radiation therapy with a common abort switch (col. 12, lines 3-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the abort switch to allow termination of radiation therapy if the correct parameters are not optimum (col. 13, lines 58-63). Furthermore,

Dietz/Rienmueller is fully capable of performing the same function (col. 4, lines 1-5 '494).

Art Unit: 3731

Contacts

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael G. Mendoza whose telephone number is (703) 305-3285. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Dawson can be reached on (703) 308-4304. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.

NANA

August 4, 2004

GLENN K. DAWSON PRIMARY EXAMINER